

The Christian Science Monitor; 54 percent support opening the area; the Chicago Tribune; 52 percent support opening the area. Three out of four support increased oil and gas exploration in our country.

The League of Conservation Voters goes on to state:

America needs a sensible energy policy that places serious emphasis on energy conservation and alternative fuels. . .

Title VI of our bill focuses on energy efficiency, conservation, and assistance to low-income families. Title VII of the bill focuses on alternative fuels and renewable energy.

Our tax provisions have several new incentives for energy-efficient homes, appliances, vehicles, and for renewables.

As I indicated in my opening remarks, the Center for Strategic International Studies says, unfortunately, that we will remain dependent on fossil fuels for the near future. Shouldn't we direct our efforts towards developing technology to use these fuels more cleanly and more efficiently? We simply can't ignore our reliance on foreign oil. As I indicated, it is expected to reach 70 percent by the year 2002. We cannot ignore our coal at 52 percent of our electricity. We can't ignore nuclear, which is 20 percent of our electricity.

Instead of a comprehensive approach, some environmental groups want a national energy policy that requires massive shifts in our energy industry. Elimination of fossil fuels entirely, thousands of jobs lost, higher energy prices, and standard investment are not in their equation.

Our approach to an energy policy—the National Energy Security Act of 2001—we think is the right approach. It is comprehensive. It is balanced.

Obviously, in the hearing process we had input from all Members, and the administration is yet to be heard. But we are trying to use the philosophy of using the fuels of today to yield the technologies of tomorrow and ensuring clean, secure, and affordable energy in the future. I think this bill attempts to do that.

Let me leave you with one additional thought. We hear from many of the opponents of ANWR that all we have to do is get an extra 3 miles per gallon out of our cars and we will get the same amount of oil as drilling and opening up that area in our State. I question that claim. The real issue is do you think everyone in America should trade in their cars and buy new vehicles. And there are about 132 million cars in America. That doesn't count the trucks and the buses. But if the Americans have to go all out and buy new and efficient cars as pseudoenvironmentalists want them to do, it will cost more than \$2.6 trillion. Since most Americans don't have \$20,000 sitting around just waiting to go

buy a new car, they are going to have to finance that car. That will probably raise the cost to more than \$3 trillion. That seems to be their answer to Americans—get a new car and spend \$3 trillion. That isn't going to happen either.

I think everyone has a responsibility to make some positive contributions to this legislation and recognize what is happening to our economy as a consequence of the scarcity of energy associated with the higher prices and the fact that energy is, indeed, taking a larger share out of everyone's budget and, as a consequence, affecting dramatically our economy.

Let's get serious, and let's do something meaningful about this.

I thank my colleague for the additional time. I appreciate the courtesy, and at any time I will certainly respond.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, as amended by the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Nevada, Mr. ENSIGN, has control of the time until 10:40 a.m.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes following the statement of Senator ENSIGN.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

#### LET NO NEVADA CHILD BE LEFT BEHIND

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, Nevada's slogan is "Battle Born." And Nevadans are proud to use that slogan. It is on our State flag. It reflects the firmness of purpose and the willingness to fight for what is right that is so much a part of the character of Nevadans. This is as true today as it was when our State entered the Union during the Civil War.

I am humbled to stand here in this Chamber where many distinguished Nevadans have preceded me, giants like Pat McCarran, Alan Bible, Howard Cannon, Paul Laxalt, and the man I succeeded, Dick Bryan. None of them forgot the unique culture of the West and their Nevada roots. The nature of the challenges may have changed over the years, but not the nature of the Nevadans fighting to overcome them.

In this era of globalization we are condemning our children, and our nation, to an uncertain future if we fail to confront a very different kind of threat—the intractable problems in our public schools.

Let me share some troubling statistics with you. If you compare our children to their counterparts in other nations, the most academically advanced American high school seniors ranked 15 out of 16—second from the bottom—on an advanced math test and 16 out of 16

on an advanced physics test. This is unacceptable.

Our public schools are failing our children. And unless we address this problem now—today—we will bear the consequences for a generation or more. Let's not forget: Today's students are tomorrow's leaders—in business, technology, engineering, government and every other field. If even the brightest of our young people cannot compete in the classroom with their colleagues abroad in math and science, how will they be able to compete with them as adults in the world of business? How can we expect them to develop into the innovators America needs to maintain—and, yes, expand—her dominant role in the global marketplace?

We need to make sure every single student in America graduates with the basic skills in communications, math, and information technology that are necessary to excel in the New Economy. As a nation, we simply cannot afford to accept the status quo.

As a fourth generation Nevadan, I know the people of my State are up to the challenge of creating a better education system. But they need the Federal Government to get out of their way so they can do it. We need a results-based system, which gives States greater flexibility to spend Federal education dollars, while holding them accountable for student achievement.

Today, Federal funds for States and local school districts are not linked to whether academic progress has been attained. The Department of Education simply doles out money in keeping with Washington-designed funding formulas and grant proposals. There is no incentive for innovation, and no penalty for failure.

President Bush wants to change this. He has proposed requiring federally funded annual reading and math testing in grades 3-8 to ensure student achievement and hold States accountable for the Federal money they receive. The test results will be the ruler by which the Department of Education can measure whether students are improving. These results will also provide parents with the information they need to track the progress of not only their own children, but of the schools their children attend.

The question we are all struggling with is what to do if and when this new system reveals that a particular school is failing to successfully educate our children. Under President Bush's plan, if a school is shown to be failing after three years (based on objective measures of student achievement), then a voucher will be given to parents whose children attend that failing school. The parents will then have the power to say to school officials: Shape up—or my kids are shipping out.

Now, I am certainly open to real alternatives to vouchers that are not driven by the anti-choice agenda of entrenched interests. However, I am not

willing to sacrifice the well-being of individuals—our children—in order to preserve failing institutions. In my opinion, vouchers are an important part of the solution.

But to those who oppose them, let me challenge you—parents, teachers, administrators, alike—to come up with a better system that accomplishes just two things: First, it holds schools accountable for failing our children; and second, it actually helps the students. Together, we must find a way to save our children from being condemned to a virtual prison of poor literacy and numeracy which constrains their ability to succeed.

That means exploring all the options—from vouchers to charter schools—that can help level the playing field for our disadvantaged young people. For example, a new charter school will be opening in Las Vegas this fall—the Andre Agassi College Preparatory Academy—which will be committed to providing students access to technology on a daily basis.

The principal, Mr. Wayne Tanaka, left Clark High School, my alma mater, to help found this revolutionary new academy. He did it because he believed this focus would provide underprivileged students with a chance to excel in the classroom. And if they excel in the classroom, then ultimately they will have the tools to excel in the 21st century.

While I am pleased President Bush has proposed an 11-percent increase in funding for Federal education programs, I am concerned Nevada students will not be receiving their fair share of that increase. Currently, Nevadans get back only 41 cents for every dollar they send back to Washington, DC, for the education of their children. For years, this return has lagged behind nearly every State in the Union. It is just not right.

The majority of Federal education dollars are allocated through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under Title I, Nevadans received a little over \$600 per eligible student in the year 1999. Let's compare that to over \$1,300 per student in Vermont.

I ask my colleagues, is this fair? Is a disadvantaged student in Vermont that much more worthy of additional funds than a disadvantaged student in Nevada? Does this promote the idea of equal access to education?

The theme of President Bush's education plan is "no child left behind." But under the current system children are getting left behind in fast growing States such as Nevada, and the President's plan does not adequately address this problem.

Nevada has grown by 66 percent over the last 10 years and shows no signs of slowing down. Under Title I, funding is based on the number of Title I students in each State, but the Department of

Education updates these numbers only once every 4 years. And for Nevada, which has grown an average of 5 percent per year for the last 10 years, this has created an untenable situation.

Nevada school enrollment is increasing at three times the national average, and Federal funds are not keeping pace. In Clark County, which is where Las Vegas is, we are forced to build one new elementary school a month just to keep pace with the explosive growth. It is for that reason I am speaking with the White House and a number of my colleagues about a new high-growth grant, which I hope to include in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This grant will benefit all States with high growth rates, such as Nevada, Arizona, Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, and other States, so that we can give real meaning to the phrase "no child left behind."

Mr. President, I need my colleagues to understand what the students, parents, teachers, and administrators are faced with in my home State of Nevada. Every time I speak with them, I hear, time and time again, that our State needs more of these Title I dollars. The high growth grant is a means to provide high-growth States much needed relief without directly adjusting the current funding formula.

Ensuring that our children stay in school is one of my top priorities. I want to work with my colleagues on dropout prevention, particularly with the senior Senator from Nevada, who has been a leader on this issue. But what good does it do to keep young people in the classroom if they are not being taught the basics of civic virtue, such as citizenship, justice, fairness, respect, responsibility, and trustworthiness?

In addition to dropout prevention programs, we must also promote character education programs that train our young people to be virtuous citizens.

Our Nation's teachers are the key to solving many of our problems in our schools. And how can we require this of our teachers without the proper training or adequate pay?

I am encouraged that President Bush's education plan includes a new commitment to professional development for teachers. This is critical to ensuring that our teachers are properly trained to teach our Nation's children.

With all the talk about school construction and whether or not the Federal Government should or should not play a role in that activity, shouldn't we first ensure that our teachers are properly trained in the subjects they teach? Our math and science teachers need better training in math and science. Our reading and writing teachers need better training in reading and writing. It is that simple. We cannot expect our teachers to succeed in imparting knowledge to our children if

our teachers are not properly trained in the areas they teach.

Teachers and administrators must be permitted to take the necessary steps to restore order in the classrooms. The Federal Government can work with State and local school districts to ensure that teachers have the freedom to discipline violent and disruptive students without the fear of lawsuits.

Our young people have a fundamental right to classrooms where they are free to learn and teachers are free to teach. That is denied them when a few chronically difficult children are allowed to poison the atmosphere, and teachers are left with no resources to stop them.

We also need to end the cycle of social promotion. Social promotion forces teachers to deal with underprepared students while they try to teach the prepared. It gives parents a false sense of progress and leads employers to conclude that diplomas are literally meaningless. But above all, the practice of social promotion dumps poorly educated graduates into a society where they cannot perform in the workplace, nor care for their families, nor discharge their duties as citizens. It is not fair to those individuals who have been at the mercy of a flawed system, and it is not fair to their dependents and our society as a whole.

I have been witness to the perils of social promotion. One of the heart-breaking experiences of my life was when I was sitting in a local library with a fourth grader who could not read Dr. Seuss's "Cat in the Hat." This young boy, when he was 10 years old, could not read these lines:

The sun did not shine. It was too wet to play. So we sat in the house all that cold, cold, wet day.

This child is one of the lucky ones. His problem was caught relatively early. He has since received help with basic reading and other academic and social skills, skills that he should have learned in the first, second, and third grades. He is 13 now, and he is doing better. He has worked hard and made progress. But despite his efforts, he is still struggling to catch up with his classmates because habits of social promotion shuffled him forward in a system before he was ready.

If we expect our students to be able to compete in the global workforce, then we must provide them with the proper learning tools. Part of that answer lies in providing technology and the means to use it. Another part lies in better teacher training and higher teacher pay. Another part lies in holding failing schools accountable, and giving parents greater control over where and how education dollars are spent. And another part lies in more equitable funding. Together these individual answers create a solution.

The 107th Congress has a unique opportunity to fundamentally change the

Federal Government's role in education. I am not satisfied with the status quo, and neither are Nevada parents. After 36 years, the system is ripe for change. On behalf of Nevada families, I intend to press for that change.

I know that Nevadans have a fighting spirit to make our schools the best in the country—a fighting spirit that has been passed on, starting with our settlers, from one generation to the next. Our battle-born State was formed by facing up to difficult challenges, and we are up for the challenge of making sure that when it comes to education, no child is left behind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Under the previous order, the senior Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### COMMENDING SENATOR ENSIGN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for more than 30 years, Senator Richard Bryan and I served together in various public offices. We took the bar together. We became inseparable friends. We were known in Nevada—and are still known—as the “Gold Dust Twins.” So when Senator Bryan decided to retire, it was a tremendous personal blow to me. I really miss Richard.

But in life you move on. I feel so fortunate to be able to serve with JOHN ENSIGN. JOHN and I have known each other for a long time. His family, prior to 1998, were some of my biggest supporters. In 1998, of course, we ran against each other. It was an extremely close race, one of the closest races in the history of the State of Nevada, and, of course, in the history of the country.

It is easy to be gracious when you win; it is not so easy when you lose. It shows the goodness of a person as to how they are able to take defeat. JOHN ENSIGN could write a book on how people who suffer adversity should react.

Twenty-four years prior to that race between REID and ENSIGN, I lost a very close race in the State of Nevada. I didn't handle it nearly as well as JOHN ENSIGN handled his loss. I only wish I had handled the loss in 1974 the way JOHN ENSIGN did in 1998. To his credit, not only did he handle it, as my father would say, “as a man,” he handled it extremely well. Not only that, he came back and 2 years later was elected to the Senate. One reason he was elected as easily as he was is how he handled the loss in 1998.

I am happy to be on the floor today at the time of the maiden speech of the junior Senator from the State of Nevada. I am sure his parents were watching on C-SPAN, and I know how proud they are. His father is a very quiet man. He goes to very few public functions. When he does, he is easy to find because he is always back someplace,

usually alone, watching his son. His mother is more in the mix of things, but I am sure they were watching this morning as their son delivered his first speech on the Senate floor. I am sure they are very proud of JOHN, as they should be. He has been a real good son.

He is well educated. He is a doctor of veterinary medicine. He is someone who has been a successful businessman, both in the veterinary field and also in the business field. More important than that, JOHN ENSIGN has something his parents are more proud of than how he has succeeded in his professional public life. They are more proud of how he succeeded in his personal life. His wife Darlene and he have been extraordinary parents. I called JOHN at home not long ago and Darlene took the phone. I said: Could I speak to JOHN; what is he doing? She said: He is on the bed playing with the kids. That is what dads are supposed to be doing.

Mr. President, Mayor LaGuardia in New York City started a saying that we all use now: There is no Democratic or Republican way of cleaning the streets. That is true. In that same vein, there is no Democratic or Republican way of handling the problems that come to us in the State of Nevada, as they come to people in the State of Virginia. There is no strictly Democratic or Republican way of fixing the problems in the State of Nevada.

JOHN ENSIGN and I know that. That is why as soon as the election was over this past November he and I got together and said that we were going to set an example for the people of the State of Nevada. Everyone knew of the friendship of Richard Bryan and HARRY REID, but people were doubtful how HARRY REID and JOHN ENSIGN could represent the State of Nevada. Were we simply going to cancel each other's votes and be mean spirited about how we reacted to each other?

We were not going to vote the same way all the time, but we decided we would be gentlemen in the way that we handled the problems of the people of the State of Nevada. We believed there was no reason we couldn't become friends, just as HARRY REID and Richard Bryan were friends. While we are only a few months into this relationship, we both feel very good about it. We are on the road to setting an example for having the best bipartisan relationship in the history of the State of Nevada. We are going to try to do that. We vow to work closely together to protect the interests of our home State and protect the interests of bipartisan-ship.

We are here now. The Senate is 50/50. It is not going to stay that way. We don't know how much longer, whether the Democrats are going to control the Senate or the Republicans. Regardless of that, ENSIGN and REID are going to work together and have a good bipartisan relationship.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Today Senator ENSIGN in his maiden speech talked about substantive issues. These are substantive issues he has talked about for a number of years. He feels strongly about education and other matters. I am very proud of his first speech. I can remember my first Senate speech. Presiding over the Senate that day was Senator David Pryor of Arkansas. I gave a speech on the Taxpayers' Bill of Rights. That is now law. I was very fortunate the man that ran the subcommittee that had jurisdiction over this issue liked what I said. CHUCK GRASSLEY was listening. He was also interested in this issue. Immediately I got bipartisan support for the legislation, and it became law.

I salute my friend JOHN ENSIGN for his first speech. I look forward to many years of service to the State of Nevada by JOHN ENSIGN. I look forward to many years of friendship between JOHN ENSIGN and HARRY REID.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Nevada—I call him that, too—he has welcomed me to the Senate. He has shown me the ropes. As he discussed, we are going to work for the people of the State of Nevada because there are a lot of issues that affect our State that are very unique to it. They are not Republican or Democratic issues. We have agreed to disagree on issues that we feel strongly about that are national issues, and that is fine. We hope to also set an example for the rest of the Senate of how one can agree or not agree but not be disagreeable.

I thank the senior Senator from Nevada. He is representing our State in the tremendous position he is in today. We in Nevada are all very proud of him. I thank Mr. REID for attending my maiden speech on the floor. I look forward to many great years of working together.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, as amended, the time until 11:17 shall be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS.

#### ENERGY POLICY

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senators from Nevada for their conversation. Certainly we have a lot of things in common with Nevada, mostly public lands. We don't have the gambling revenue, however.

I rise to speak a few moments today on energy and energy policy. Certainly,